DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 107 UD 010 713

TITLE	"Education and Race Relations" Inservice Training Course: Final Technical Report, Summary Statement of the College Coordinator for the Television Course, Report on Dissemination Efforts, and Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	11 Aug 67
GRANT	OEG-36-31-E016
NOTE	45p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Broadcast Television; *Changing Attitudes; Course Evaluation; *Educational Television; Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Intergroup Relations; *Race Relations; School Integration; Teacher Education; *Telecourses; Television
IDENTIFIERS	Boston; WGBH-TV

ABSTRACT

This program utilized a series of films for in-service training of high school teachers in the Boston Metropolitan Area. The course was developed by the Lincoln-Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs and was televised by WGBH-TV in Boston. The series of 28 broadcasts were divided as follows: the initial 45-minute program contained the substantive presentation by an expert in his field; the second program two days later was a discussion by teachers and experts of the presentation given earlier. The planning, the production of the syllabus, and the broadcasts took place in 1965-1966. [Twelve graphs supportive of the final report section have been deleted from this document due to poor reproducibility.] (Authors/CB)

ED056107

"Education and Race Relations" Inservice Training Course

Final Technical Report
Grant Number: OE-36-31-E016

Submitted by
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education
Boston, Massachusetts

Under provisions of Title IV, Section 405
P.L. 88-352

August 11, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD010713

REPORT ON PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS SPONSORING "EDUCATION AND RACE RELATIONS" IN-SERVICE TRAINING COURSE

by

Dr. Bradbury Seasholes

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

RECEIVED
OE/EEOP
AUG 14 1967
AM
7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 5 6 PM

THE LINCOLN FILENE CENTER FOR CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

19 June 1967

Memorandum

TO: Dr. Thomas Curtin

FROM: Bradbury Seasholes

SUBJECT: Education and Race Relations"

This constitutes the final report covering the following: direct observation of use of the "Education and Race Relations" films for in-service training of high school teachers in the Boston Metropolitan Area, and an analysis of evaluative information derived from questionnaires administered to participants taking the course under both high school and college auspices.

I. Direct Observation of High School Programs

Comments based on direct observation of the use of the films in high school settings are grouped as follows: participants; physical arrangements; perceptions of program; and nature of discussion groups.

A. Participants

Enrollment in the six high schools offering the course was extremely varied, ranging from 93 in Medford High School to 9 in Lexington. The motivation for participating also varied. For many, the attractions of in-service credit seemed to have played a major part in the decision to enroll. Others undoubtedly chose to take part primarily out of a substantive interest and emotional concern. Regardless of the primary motivation, it was quite clear from discussions in the sessions and from informal conversations that the overwhelming majority of those participating came to the sessions with an initial favorable disposition toward Negroes and their problems in schooling. This is not to say that these people adequately understood the problem or its solutions, prior to the series or in many respects after the series. But at least they seemed to think they understood the problem and to think that they sympathize. Only a handful of participants could be characterized as hostile to Negroes.

Teachers enrolled in the program taught from throughout the grade range, kindergarten to sixth grade. Women predominated in numbers.

Attendance held up quite well, with certain exceptions. Those exceptions involved particular circumstances which more or less required a drop in attendance; for example, a competing teachers' meeting of one sort or another.

THE LINCOLN FILENE CENTER FOR CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

19 June 1967

Memorandum

TO: Dr. Thomas Curtin

FROM: Bradbury Seasholes

SUBJECT: Education and Race Relations"

This constitutes the final report covering the following: direct observation of use of the "Education and Race Relations" films for in-service training of high school teachers in the Boston Metropolitan Area, and an analysis of evaluative information derived from questionnaires administered to participants taking the course under both high school and college auspices.

I. Direct Observation of High School Programs

Comments based on direct observation of the use of the films in high school settings are grouped as follows: participants; physical arrangements; perceptions of program; and nature of discussion groups.

A. Participants

Enrollment in the six high schools offering the course was extremely varied, ranging from 93 in Medford High School to 9 in Lexington. The motivation for participating also varied. For many, the attractions of in-service credit seemed to have played a major part in the decision to enroll. Others undoubtedly chose to take part primarily out of a substantive interest and emotional concern. Regardless of the primary motivation, it was quite clear from discussions in the sessions and from informal conversations that the overwhelming majority of those participating came to the sessions with an initial favorable disposition toward Negroes and their problems in schooling. This is not to say that these people adequately understood the problem or its solutions, prior to the series or in many respects after the series. But at least they seemed to think they understood the problem and to think that they sympathize. Only a handful of participants could be characterized as hostile to Negroes.

Teachers enrolled in the program taught from throughout the grade range, kindergarten to sixth grade. Women predominated in numbers.

Attendance held up quite well, with certain exceptions. Those exceptions involved particular circumstances which more or less required a drop in attendance; for example, a competing teachers' meeting of one sort or another.

B. Physical setting

Three of the schools viewed the panel discussions (the "B" programs) on Thursday afternoon together in a school setting and then held their own discussions immediately afterward in classrooms. In these schools, the presentation films ("A") were viewed by individuals in their homes. Cambridge held group viewing of both the presentation and discussion films and had its discussion before rather than after the 4:15 p.m. showing on Thursday. As a consequence, its discussions formally were of the presentation tape rather than of the discussion tape. Boston held its discussion on Wednesday, independent of any viewing, in order to avoid too many conflicts with other faculty meetings. Because the enrollment in the Lexington program was low, its participants arranged its viewing and discussions on a more informal basis in individuals' homes. On the whole it would appear that the larger groups suffered somewhat in their viewing sessions because of a limitation in the number of television sets.

C. Perceptions of program

The participants seemed genuinely engrossed in the material presented over television--this, in spite of some occasionally pedestrian performances. This was evidenced by such indices as note-taking and later recall of specific substance. When subject areas that were particularly close to their interests were touched on, some participants became extremely interested. For example, early, somewhat cavalier references made by panelists in the television tapes to vocational education were taken as insulting and were strongly resented by teachers from vocational schools, even through the comments in question had little bearing on the main thrust of the programs. The fact that the participants came from a wide grade level did not appear to become as problematical as one might have anticipated. There was an evidence of a fairly high skill into relating what was presented on the tapes to a variety of children's age and ability levels.

The participants seemed to accept the expertise of the program lecturers and panelists. Initially there was great confusion about the interaction between Professors Kvaraceus and Gibson, some participants expressing dismay that the latter was "picking on" the former. In later weeks the true relationship between these two panelists was more clearly understood, with several participants volunteering great favoritism toward Dr. Gibson.

A problem which persevered throughout the program--from the perspective of the participants--was the age-old one of bringing somewhat abstract material to bear on very concrete problems. Participants tended to pose this as a shortcoming of the series in spite of some particular programs which in fact were rather specific in addressing themselves to practical application, and in spite of psychological evidence (cited below) indicates that by-and-large they did not recall specific programs as being too abstract.

D. Nature of discussion groups

The live discussions could be typified by referring to what the Cambridge program did. There, overall responsibility for discussions was delegated to five or six small-group discussion leaders handling approximately eight participants. While this had strong advantages, liabilities must also be noted. There existed distinct differences in leadership ability from small group to small group. Despite the small size, each of the small groups seemed to harbor at least three members who felt unable to contribute much of anything to the ongoing conversation. This seems not to have stemmed from lack of interest, but rather from insecurity. A few group leaders, of course, produced total participation by formally incorporating each member of the group into the discussion; that is, by calling on each by name. Insufficient attention was given to more creative ways for getting everyone into the act. On the other hand, some discussion leaders (notably William Hollman, then of the Newton Public Schools) demonstrated real skill in handling small or medium group discussions.

Perhaps the most serious question about the discussion groups was their ability or inability to see the structure of a given lecture or of the total course and to maintain relevance in their comments. Some discussion leaders clung tightly to the discussion questions that accompanied the course syllabus. Others relied heavily on their notes taken while viewing. Many discussion groups used the general topic or just some small fragment that was mentioned as an excuse for some rather random excursions from the major issue or issues in question. As an illustration: Following one of the Riessman tapes, one discussion group spent a great deal of time telling about attempts at easing racial imbalance in their school system while another discussion group went to lengths trying to define what the Montessori method is. Both of these were wildly irrelevant to the subject at hand.

On the whole, however, discussions were clearly thought to be relevant and engrossing to participants--and since they never really strayed from the overall subject of Negroes and schools, broadly conceived, one must, on the whole, view these interactions as decidedly meaningful and contributory to the objectives of the total enterprise.

II. Evaluation of Program Through Questionnaires

Participants were given the opportunity to evaluate each of the individual television programs at the last meeting of the fact-to-face groups. The evaluations consisted primarily of Semantic Differential responses, gauging participant feelings about whether each program was strong or weak, active or passive, good or bad.* The general format is indicated in Figure A, which shows one hypothetical participant's

---

* These three sets of antonymous adjectives identify the three major factors or modes of response most people utilize in reacting to concepts, as determined by empirical research and factor analysis conducted originally by Charles E. Osgood. (See C. E. Osgood et al., The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.)

---

responses to Program 14. Participants were instructed to place a checkmark in one of the seven blanks which best characterized how they felt a particular adjective pair applied to the cited television program. The specific instructions that were given appear as Figure B.

FIGURE A: One participant's hypothetical responses to Program 14

PROGRAM NUMBER: 14.....

bad				X			good
controversial			X				noncontroversial
relevant			X				irrelevant
active			X				passive
disorganized				X			organized
informative			X				not informative
strong			X				weak
unemotional				X			emotional
useful			X				useless
concrete				X			abstract
made me feel better about other people				X			made me feel worse about other people
made me feel better about myself				X			made me feel worse about myself

THE ABOVE ANSWERS BASED ON: [X] memory [ ] memory plus notes

If the total series of television programs were to be shown again, to teachers or others like youself, would you recommend that this particular program be kept in the series?

no				X			yes

Any comments?:

FIGURE B: Instructions for Semantic Differential evaluation of programs

---

Plans are being made for possible reuse of the television lectures and panels in this and other states. In order to incorporate improvements, we would appreciate your helping us evaluate the televised portions of the course.

In assessing the television programs on the pages that follow, you may, if you desire, refer to notes. (Indicate reliance on notes by checking the appropriate box on each page.) You will find a synopsis of programs at the end of this form. It may be torn off for easier use.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. After the words, "PROGRAM NUMBER:", number each page in sequence (1, 2, 3, . . .).

2. Turn to the page for PROGRAM NUMBER 1. The basic set of questions asks you to put an "X" on the line where it seems best to apply. For instance, if that particular program seems modestly controversial, you might put your X on the third (or perhaps the second) line:

controversial___:___:_X_:___:___:___:___noncontroversial

If the program was decidedly useful, the line nearest the word, "useful" would be used:

useful_X_:___:___:___:___:___:___useless

Use of the fourth (middle) line should indicate one of the following:

a. The program fell right in the middle.
b. The adjectives aren't applicable to the program.
c. The program was at times one way, at other times the opposite; on balance, the two ended up being equal.
d. "Don't know," "Can't remember," "Didn't see program," etc.

In general, the Xes should be made rather quickly. We are not so much after "studied answers" as after basic, quick reactions.

THESE QUESTIONS REFER JUST TO THE TELEVISED MATERIAL. DO NOT TRY TO INCORPORATE YOUR REACTIONS TO YOUR OWN DISCUSSION SESSIONS.

3. Proceed to evaluate the other programs, on the remaining pages of this form.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL. The only identification we ask is that you write the name of the city or college under whose auspices you took this course.

By assigning numerical values to the seven blanks, it is possible to assign a single numerical value to each checkmark made by each individual -- and consequently to devise aggregate scores or mean scores for all participants relating to any one adjective pair. For example, it is possible to determine the median score attributed to Program 14 by all participants to any single pair of adjectives. Such median scores form the basis of the graphic analysis of programs on the pages which follow.

A pitfall to avoid is the assumption that there are "desirable" answers among the lists of adjective pairs. This may or may not be the case. We can assume that there is agreement that responses towards the "good" end of the good-bad continuum are desirable. But where checkmarks fell on the "unemotional-emotional" continuum (for example) is not likely to evoke evaluational consensus. For some programs an emotional impact might or might not have been desirable; and scholars, program directors, government agencies may differ on whether, in general, an emotional or unemotional approach is desirable.

A. The graphs

The programs analyzed by means of graphs are the "A", or presentation programs. The nine adjective pairs represent the three factors described above, plus several other "dimensions" seemed important to an assessment of this particular enterprise.

For purposes of sharper graphic analysis, ten programs are plotted, rather than the full set. * These ten are those which scored highest and lowest (five each) in medians on an additional question, ". . . would you recommend that this particular program be kept in the series?"

---

* The ten are: (high scores) #7, Negro in American History I; #27, Human Rights in World Affairs; #1, Education and Race Relations; #3, Social Psychology of Prejudice; and #5, The Negro Child and School; (low scorers) #21, Civil Liberties and Civil Rights; #25, Co- and Extracurricular Activities; #15, Teaching Human Relations I; #23, Post-school Opportunities; and #17, Teaching Human Relations II. Omitted from this analysis is #9, the continuation of the Negro in American History, which because of its unity with the earlier program was not considered by many participants as a separate entity.

The full set of presentation programs are graphed and discussed in the context of this and a few other summarizing questions, which strictly speaking are not part of the Semantic Differential analysis proper.

The adjective pairs are discussed in the following order: first, the three major dimenions -- bad-good, strong-weak, and active-passive; then a set dealing primarily with cognitive learning -- informative-not informative, concrete-abstract, disorganized-organized, and relevant-irrelevant; and finally, two sets of adjectives -- controversial-noncontroversial and unemotional-emotional -- which are affective in character.

Bad-good. The overwhelming positive feelings towards the series is evident from the strong skew to the right in Figure 1. Even those programs which participants felt least strongly should be included in any repeat of the series (indicated on the graph by dashed lines) were judged leniently here. While a set of responses of this type may reflect, among other things, participants' unwillingness to be tough, the graph should be taken as a source of genuine optimism about the series as a whole. As one might expect, there is a heavy correlation between this graph and the participants' judgments about which programs should be retained in future series.

Strong-weak. There is no logical or psychological necessity for a correlation to exist between the good-bad and strong-weak attributions. In this particular instance, however, there is such a relationship; to appreciate it visually, it is necessary to reverse Figure 2 before comparing it to Figure 1. Some differentiation is evident, however. For example, Program #1 is highly rated in Figure 1, but is not seen as especially "strong". Its position as the necessary opener, the broad overview, is probably responsible for this difference. On the whole, however, this dimension adds little new to the assessment of the programs.

Active-passive. Once again, it is important to recognize that a judgment of "active" is not necessarily a compliment; for instance, as a characterization of a "live" teacher attempting to teach by the discovery method in a classroom, one could argue that an "active" rating would not be desirable. Nevertheless these responses (Figure 3) once again show a strong resemblance to the good-bad and strong-weak answers. A minor shift in assessment of the History of the American Negro program, #7, can be seen, reflecting, one must assume, its absolutely deadpan mode of presentation--but the participants were clearly not fundamentally disturbed by this aspect of Lincoln's work. In this graph, as in the others to this point, the programs on teaching human relations (#15 and #17) are rated poorly not so much because of middling responses but because of a lack of consensus; participants were divided in their feelings about these two programs in a way not evident elsewhere. By contrast, the other low scorers "suffer" from heavy use of middle categories, rather than of the extreme

Informative-not, disorganized-organized, and relevant-irrelevant (Figures 4, 5, and 6). Three of the four adjective pairs that have been grouped as cognitive in orientation show strong resemblance. Participant enthusiasms for particular programs were apparently strongly influenced by the considerations measured by these continua. The valuations given the Negro History presentation are phenomenal, given their relative position as against other programs. In contrast, Programs #15, and #17 are again downgraded, with an especially harsh judgment rendered against #15 on the question of relevancy. With 63% of the participants stating that a didactic exposition of noncontemporary Negro history is strongly relevant while at the same time only 2% conclude that a program dealing with how to handle discussions of race in the classroom is strongly relevant, the "objective" analyst is tempted to enter a vigorous protest about participant awareness of what the course was supposedly about; this protest, however, will be withheld until the section on conclusions, below.

Concrete-abstract. Figure 7, when compared with the three Figures preceding it, betrays an interesting mental set participants seemed to have brought to the programs. While it is obvious that they valued concreteness highly, (and apparently equated it to a large extent with relevance, informativeness, and organization), they were not at the same time intent upon downgrading abstraction. While there is always a temptation to characterize material that is felt to be boring, too difficult, or irrelevant as "abstract", these participants tended not to use the right-hand categories, making their differentiations instead among the various gradations of concreteness (categories 4, 5, 6, and 7). To them the series as a whole did not suffer (or benefit, some might argue) from abstract treatment.

Emotional-unemotional. The results indicated in Figure 8 are surprising in that so many participants saw the programming as emotionally neutral. The subject matter, after all, is one with high emotional potential, with ample opportunities for empathy, hate, anger, anxiety. By-and-large the course did not apparently recreate the emotional vitality of the real world situation it was dealing with. The two Pettigrew programs (#3 and #5) had more emotional impact than most, as did the History of Negroes (#7). Interestingly, #7 was also a program a fair number thought was unemotional. The introductory program, #1, was distinctly unemotional, in the eyes of these viewers--a fact which might have strategic implications for the series as a whole.

Controversial-noncontroversial. In light of strong uniformities in response to the earlier pairs of adjectives, Figure 9 demonstrates unusual participant discrimination among programs. And in many ways it provides important insight into the evaluation criteria operating, without (regrettably) demonstrating consistency. Program #1 is again seen as bland, as is #7 -- two of the consistently most favored programs in the series. Yet, the two Pettigrew programs, also valued highly, are seen as distinctly controversial. Programs #23 and #25, both dealing with activities outside central classroom setting, stand out as being perceived as controversial -- the first instance in which a clearcut rationale for their generally low rating seems to emerge. In contrast, #15 and #17 were not rated as controversial. It would have to be said, setting these findings against the earlier graphs, that the presence or absence of controversial material did not have much bearing on participants' hierarchal preferences among programs as measured, for example, by the good-bad continuum.

* * * * * * * * * *

Dyadic change. Two other questions, presented in a format similar to the adjective pairs, sought to determine how much emotional effect the programs had in terms of feelings towards other people (Negroes and whites who interact in various ways with Negroes) and feelings about one's self. The responses to these questions are summarized in Figures 10 and 11. Both graphs indicate that any such changes in feeling were distinctly marginal. Of those who observed any change in themselves or in the environment with which they interact, there was clear movement towards feeling more optimistic. Percentage differences among programs are too small to consider as significant and hence to comment upon.

Should the program be retained? As a broad gauge of sentiment towards the programs, the participants gave their opinions about whether individual programs should be kept in the series for later use. As Figure 12 shows, overwhelming support for the series as an aggregate of individual programs was evoked by the question. Programs #15 and #17 were "knocked" by a significant proportion of the participants, but were also highly recommended for continued inclusion by a large percentage.

Conclusion

In summary of the graphic analysis just described, and of further analysis of those programs not included in the graphs, certain modes of participant preference can be identified. The programs most highly valued, with the exception of the introductory program, were straight lecture format, historical or current event (Human Rights in World Affairs) in content, and not primarily aimed at race problems in schools.

Ranked somewhat below these were three programs -- the two Pettigrew presentations and one on motivation by Bernard Harleston -- which discussed the psychological dimensions of the race problem.

A third cluster included two programs with a political focus: Political Socialization and Race Relations, and Civil Liberties and Civil Rights. Participants were reluctant to accept the relevance of discussing Negro political action in a course dealing with education and race relations.

The lowest ranked cluster of programs were in a sense those with the most relevance of all (in the eyes of the series designers). Of all the programs they dealt most heavily with the concrete problems of teaching about race and dealing with racial situations in the day-to-day operations of the schools.

The fact that substantive consistencies can be found like these reinforces the sense that content was uppermost in establishing the hierarchy of preferred programs, that approach to television presentation may have also been involved (in that some subjects required other than a straight lecture approach), and that matters such as personality, mannerisms, and personal appearance had little or nothing to do with the rankings. (It must be said, however, that it is not always possible to separate out these last idiosyncrasies. For example, the three least appreciated programs in the series were the responsibility of the only lecturers who were women).

These findings and conclusions point in directions that are crystal-clear if what is desired in similar series in the future is high audience appreciation. But the results of this evaluation should not be taken indiscriminately as a mandate for certain kinds of programming. It is apparent that many of the participants would have been satisfied with a steady diet of didactic history, a simulation of a college course in Negro history. They tend to be impatient with less formal presentations, presentations which, for example, do not lend themselves to heavy note-taking. One must consider whether this is a "consumer preference" which must necessarily be catered to, or whether program objectives are more important than performance popularity (not that these need always be in conflict!). The data presented here as participant evaluation should be one input into any discussion of modfications of the present series or of the creation of other similar series; but there must be other inputs as well if social change is to be the output.

EVALUATION OF "EDUCATION AND RACE RELATIONS" COURSE

THROUGH THE USE OF A

STUDENT INVENTORY - Pre-test and Post-test

Conducted and Reported

by

Dr. Irwin Rubin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Introduction

The study reported in this paper represents an attempt to evaluate an educational television course dealing with race relations in terms of its impact upon the ethnic attitudes held by the viewers. The course, entitled "Education and Race Relations", was developed by the Lincoln-Filene Center For Citizenship and Public Affairs and was shown on WGBH-TV in Boston.

Variables Measured

Harding and Schuman (1961) conceptualize prejudice as the departure from or failure to adhere to three ideal norms of behavior; the norm of rationality, the norm of justice, and the norm of human-heartedness. This study will focus upon the norms of rationality and human-heartedness.

The norm of rationality is primarily concerned with an individual's cognitive processes. An individual is said to have violated this norm if he makes hasty judgments or prejudgments, thinks in stereotypes, overgeneralizes, refuses to take account of individual differences, or refuses to change an opinion in the face of new information. This later point, particularly, distinguishes between the prejudiced and the misinformed.

An element often overlooked when considering an individual's level of rationality is the fact that judgments may be irrational in either of two directions - favorable or unfavorable to the group in question. The norm of rationality, in other words, has two components, irrationality against minority groups (Ia) and irrationality pro minority groups (Ip).

The scale used to measure this variable is composed of 48 items. (24 "anti" and 24 "pro"). The respondent is instructed to read an item, decide which of the two choices is most correct and then provide an estimate of how sure he is of his answer. A correct answer receives a score of 1. An incorrect answer about which the individual was "not very sure" receives a score of 3 and so on up to a score of 5 for any one item. Summing individual item scores yields the two indexes IA and Ip. The range of possible scores is from 24-120 with a high score indicating high irrationality.

Two sample items are presented below:

Sample item: ANTI

Not very sure	A	Physical characteristics of Negroes, such as dark skins or woolly hair, do not necessarily indicate anything about mental or moral traits.
Moderately sure	B	The typical Negroid freatures--dark skin, broad nose, woolly hair--are probably related to the more primitive nature of the Negro.
Very sure		

Sample item: PRO

Not very sure	A	The difficulties between American Indians and others in this country have nothing to do with drunkenness, disease, or ignorance among the Indians
Moderately sure	B	Many white people would accept American Indians more easily if there were less drunkenness, disease, and ignorance among them.
Very sure		

The norm of human-heartedness is primarily concerned with an individual's affective processes. An individual is said to be human-hearted to the extent that he accepts other people in terms of their common humanity, no matter how different they may seem from himself.

It can be characterized by such emotional manifestations as love, brotherhood, and sympathy.

The scale used to measure this variable is composed of 15 items of the following type:

> A colored man who is working on a construction gang is always called "boy" or "Black Sambo" by the Superintendent, whereas the white workers doing the same job are called by their actual first names. How is the colored man likely to react to this?
>
> ____(a) It probably makes little difference, since over the years he is likely to have become used to it.
>
> ____(b) He probably resents it and may even hate the Superintendent for talking to him in this way.
>
> ____(c) He may well regard it as a friendly, informal way of speaking to him, especially if the Superintendent is generally a nice person.
>
> ____(d) The story does not give enough information to tell how he would react in this particular case.

The respondent is instructed to read each item and then to check the alternative which best describes the hypothetical individual's reaction. A correct response is given a score of 1 and any of the three incorrect responses is given a score of 3. An individual's total score can range from 15-45 with a low absolute score indicating a high degree of human-heartedness (HH).

Experimental Design

In order to validly determine the impact of the television course, it is necessary to have a control group of comparable individual's who are not exposed to the course. These data would enable the researcher to determine how much of the observed changes in prejudice are the

result of a variety of extraneous factors (e.g. having answered the same questionnaire twice). Quite often, however, these ideal controls are difficult to achieve.

Data were available, however, from the participants of the 1965 NDEA Summer Institute For Teachers of Disadvantaged Youth which was also conducted by the Lincoln-Filene Center. The participants of the NDEA Institute were school teachers from the Boston area as were the viewers of the television course under investigation.[1] In terms of age, education level, occupation, and years experience, the NDEA and WGBH groups were identical.

The format of the two programs were, however, substantially different. The WGBH group viewed a series of weekly 2 hour lectures over a period of four months. In addition, once a week, they met in small local discussion groups to talk about the readings and lectures.

The NDEA program was a more concentrated experience which ran for approximately six consecutive weeks. During this period, the participants were exposed to, for example, a series of lectures (very similar to the WGBH lectures in terms of content and lecturers) seminar discussions, and practical field experiences. There are undoubtedly many differences between the two programs which are unspecifiable but one critical difference clearly has to do with the degree of interpersonal contact and face-to-face communication experienced by the participants. We will discuss this point more fully later in this report.

---

[1] For the remainder of this report, the television viewers will be referred to as the WGBH group and the NDEA Institute participants as the NDEA group. The usable sample size is 50 for the NDEA group and 190 for the WGBH group.

Utilization of the NDEA group, in conjunction with the WGBH group, will permit a comparative analysis of their respective abilities to alter prejudiced attitudes. Several qualifications must, however, be kept in mind when analyzing the results. The absence of a control group of people who had "zero treatment" means that nothing definitive can be said about the absolute effectiveness of either program. All that can be said, subject to one further assumption which follows, is that one program was more or less effective than the other. If equal effects are observed, this does not mean that neither program was effective in an absolute sense. It simply means that there were no <u>differential</u> effects observable.

Furthermore, given that the two programs occurred at different points in time, it is impossible to determine empirically how much of the observed changes might have been caused by environmental factors. For example, if a race riot or bussing incident were to have occurred during the period between first and second questionnaire administration, it would be impossible to determine if the observed changes were a function of the program or the participants' reactions to the environmental factors. We are assuming that the range, relevance, and intensity of such events were about the same during the two time periods covered by the WGBH and NDEA programs.

Criterion of Effectiveness

Before turning to the results of the analyses, a brief discussion of the concept of effectiveness is needed. In this study, a program's effectiveness will be evaluated by the changes it produces in the

measured variables. Change is defined as an individual's score at time 2 (after having been through the program) minus his score at time 1 (before the program began). These change scores for each variable will be summed across all participants to derive an average change score for the group.

Other measures are possible, for example, a cost analysis could be performed to determine the cost per individual unit of attitude change and this index could then be used to compare programs. The question which must then be raised, from a moral and social point of view, is how much is one unit of prejudice reduction worth to society?

By the approach taken in this study, if 20 participants increase 10 units in prejudice and 20 decrease 10 units in prejudice, the program would be deemed ineffective. Granted this net gain of zero obscures the social fact that some participants did benefit from the program. The crucial issue, however, is that the social balance has not been upset.

Results

The first question which must be examined is whether or not the WGBH and NDEA groups were, in fact, the same before the programs began on the variables measured. Table I contains the mean human-heartedness (HH), irrational "anti" (IA), and irrational "pro" (Ip) scores for both groups. The fact that the differences between these means does not reach statistical significance enables us to assume that the WGBH and NDEA groups were the "same" before they began their respective programs.

TABLE I

Initial Prejudice Scores for WGBH and NDEA Participants

	WGBH	NDEA	SIGNIFICANCE[1]
HH	26.6*	24.3*	N.S.
IA	36.5**	34.1	N.S.
Ip	58.8**	61.0	N.S.

*A high absolute score reflects a low level of human-heartedness.

**The higher the score, the more irrational the individual is assumed to be.

The data on which these means are based is summarized in Figures I and II. Figure I contains the frequency distribution of initial scores (prior to start of program) for the WGBH group. It can be seen, for example, that 12 people had a score of 15 on the human-heartedness scale, the best possible score. Similar data are contained in Figure II for the NDEA group's initial scores. Figures III and IV contain comparable frequency distributions of the after scores (at the end of the respective programs).

We are now ready to examine the comparative effectiveness of the two programs. The average difference (change) scores for both groups and the differences between the differences appear in Table II. The

---

[1] Significance refers to statistical significance. The accepted practice is not to accept any hypothesis that does not reach at least the 0.05 level of significance. This 0.05 level reflects the fact that the observed relationship could not have occurred more than 5 items out of 100 by chance, if in fact no relationship existed. N.S. means not significant.

Figure I

Frequency distribution of initial scores on the three major variables among the WGBH group.

HH SCORE	FREQUENCY	IA SCORE	FREQUENCY	IP SCORE	FREQUENCY
15	12	24	19	24-39	11
17	14	25-26	13	40-42	10
19	23	27-28	23	43-45	13
21	16	29-30	18	46-48	14
23	15	31-32	10	49-51	17
25	16	33-34	14	52-54	8
27	14	35-36	12	55-57	18
29	17	37-38	10	58-60	13
31	14	39-40	9	61-63	18
33	13	41-42	10	64-66	15
35	9	43-44	7	67-69	11
37	9	45-46	7	70-74	12
39	7	47-48	6	75-79	7
41	3	49-50	10	80-85	10
43	6	51-60	13	86-90	4
45	2	>60	7	>90	7
	N=190		N=190		N=190

Figure II

Frequency distributed of initial scores on the three major variables among the NDEA group.

HH SCORE	FREQUENCY	IA SCORE	FREQUENCY	IP SOCRE	FREQUENCY
15	8	24	7	24-39	0
17	8	25-26	9	40-42	1
19	4	27-28	4	43-45	5
21	5	29-30	5	46-48	4
23	5	31-32	3	49-51	4
25	1	33-34	5	52-54	4
27	2	35-36	4	55-57	1
29	3	37-38	3	58-60	5
31	3	39-40	1	61-63	4
33	5	41-42	1	64-66	6
35	1	43-44	0	67-69	6
37	1	45-46	1	70-74	3
39	0	47-48	1	75-79	4
41	2	49-50	0	80-85	1
43	2	51-60	4	86-90	1
45	0	>60	2	>90	1
	N=50		N=50		N=50

Figure III

Frequency distribution of after scores on the three major variables for the WGBH group

IHH SCORE	FREQUENCY
15	22
17	31
19	18
21	22
23	13
25	13
27	15
29	12
31	11
33	12
35	4
37	4
39	5
41	4
43	2
45	2
	N=190

IA SCORE	FREQUENCY
24	24
25-26	13
27-28	27
29-30	22
31-32	17
33-34	12
35-36	15
37-38	12
39-40	8
41-42	8
43-44	3
45-46	1
47-48	3
49-50	3
51-60	10
>60	10
	N=190

IP SCORE	FREQUENCY
24-39	14
40-42	9
43-45	13
46-48	10
49-51	9
52-54	10
55-57	12
56-60	13
61-63	15
64-66	12
67-69	12
70-74	9
75-79	15
80-85	13
86-90	13
>90	9
	N=190

Figure IV

Frequency distribution of the after scores on the three major variables for the NDEA group.

HH SCORE	FREQUENCY	IA SCORE	FREQUENCY	IP SCORE	FREQUENCY
15	15	24	10	24-39	0
17	11	25-26	8	40-42	0
19	6	27-28	9	43-45	1
21	3	29-30	5	46-48	3
23	2	31-32	4	49-51	2
25	3	33-34	2	52-54	4
27	5	35-36	3	55-57	3
29	2	37-38	4	58-60	3
31	1	39-40	0	61-63	7
33	1	41-42	0	64-66	2
35	1	43-44	0	67-69	4
37	0	45-46	1	70-74	7
39	0	47-48	1	75-79	4
41	0	49-50	0	80-85	3
43	0	51-60	0	86-90	2
45	0	>60	3	>90	5
	N=50		N=50		N=50

"difference between the differences" is computed for HH, for example, by subtracting the average change in HH within the WGBH group from the average change in HH within the NDEA group. Similarly for IA and Ip. This index will enable us to determine the differential effect of one program versus the other.

Table II

Mean change scores within WGBH and NDEA groups and the mean difference between change scores.

	CHANGE SCORES WGBH	CHANGE SCORES NDEA	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENCES	SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENCES
HH	-2.40	-4.40	-2.00	0.004
IA	-1.90	-2.80	-0.90	N.S.
Ip	+3.20	+4.80	+1.60	N.S.

It can be seen that within both the WGBH and NDEA groups, human-heartedness (HH) increased (a lowered score indicates a higher level of human-heartedness), irrationality in an individual's thinking against minority group (IA) decreased, but irrationality in an individual's thinking in favor of minority groups increased. HH and IA changed in the desired direction while Ip moved in a direction opposite to that desired.

The crucial test, however, is provided by the data in columns 3 and 4 of Table II. It can be seen that the members of the NDEA group increased more in human-heartedness (83% more) than the WGBH group. This difference is statistically significant beyond the 0.004 level.

The difference between the differences for IA and Ip do not approach statistical significance and we can say nothing, therefore, about the differential effect of the two programs on these variables.

Discussion of Results

The results of this study can best be discussed by first asking the more general question: what does an individual gain by holding an attitude; what functional purpose does it serve in the individual's efforts to cope with his environment?

Sarnoff and Katz (1954) point out that an attitude can serve one or more of three major motivational forces: (cf. Smith, Bruner, and White, 1956)

1. Reality testing and the search for meaning; the need to acquire consistent knowledge about the external world:
2. Reward and punishment including the needs to gain social acceptance and to avoid social disapproval;
3. Ego-defenses: the need to defend against inner conflict.

The first force emphasizes the role played by cognitive processes in the development of ethnic prejudice. In order to satisfy various specific needs and to give meaning to what would otherwise be a chaotic universe of unique events, an individual acquires a set of beliefs or attitudes. Holding an attitude provides the necessary standards or frames of reference an individual needs to understand his world.

The second force emphasizes the person's need to develop and maintain relationships with others. Holding a particular attitude enables a person to identify with a select group of people who are,

presumed to hold similar views. In one study, for example, it was found that a group of Northern students whose attitudes toward Negroes had initially been favorable, shifted their attitudes in the unfavorable direction as a result of their four year enrollment in a Southern college. In order to become more acceptable, the Northern students were motivated to espouse attitudes presumed to be in line with their Southern peers.

The third force deals primarily with the manner by which an individual copes with his own psychological conflicts. In order to protect himself from acknowledging the personal relevance of some unresolved inner feelings, the individual projects or externalizes his inner feelings upon another person. Frenkel-Brunswik, in summarizing a large portion of the definitive work in The Authoritarian Personality (1950) makes a convincing statement of this principle:

> Regardless of whether the specific topic was that of ambivalence, or aggression, or passivity, or some other related feature of personality dynamics, the outstanding finding was that the extremely unprejudiced individual tends to manifest a greater readiness to become aware of unacceptable tendencies and impulses in himself. The prejudiced individual, on the other hand, is more apt not to face these tendencies openly and thus to fail in integrating them satisfactorily with the conscious image he has of himself.

This theoretical framework has very significant implications for the design of attitude change programs. If we assume that an individual's attitude toward Negroes is based primarily [1] upon the

---

[1] To be sure, no pure cases exist and overlap should be expected.

reality testing (knowledge function) force, the change program we design would stress factual or informational inputs. However, if our initial assumption was wrong and the individual's attitude is primarily serving one of the other two functions, then we should not be surprised if we experience only moderate success with the program.

With this discussion in mind, we can now turn to the results of this study. Referring to Table I and Figures I and II, it can be seen that the members of both groups do not appear to have a lack of factual knowledge about minority groups. The mean initial IA scores were only 36.5 (WGBH) and 34.1 (NDEA) on an instrument whose theoretical range is from 24-120. Assuming for the moment perfectly valid measurement instruments, these data indicate that the samples tested expressed substantial rationality in their thinking toward minority groups even before the programs began.

On the other hand, the overall median HH score is approximately 25.0. This means that 50% of the participants, initially, missed 6 or more out of a possible 15 items on that scale. The HH measure refers primarily to the affective (feelings) component of an individual's attitude while the IA and Ip measures are concerned with the cognitive or belief component.[1] Within the samples studied, it appears that attitudes toward Negroes are based more heavily upon affective or emotional factors than cognitive factors.

---

[1] The various measures of prejudice are related statistically but the magnitude of this association is sufficiently low to permit the conclusion that they are substantially different dimensions. The correlation between HH and IA, for example, is 0.38. If the two scales were measuring exactly the same elements, the correlation would be 1.0.

This discussion provides a possible explanation as to why there were no observable differential effects between the WGBH and NDEA groups on IA and Ip.[1] Both programs provided substantial inputs of cognitive material but the recipients' attitudes appear to be based primarily on other factors. The question which must be asked now is why did the NDEA group change more than the WGBH group in human-heartedness? Although no "hard data" are available to answer this question directly, several explanations are feasible.

The WGBH viewers represent a group of people who, with the exception of weekly one hour group meetings, were exposed to a relatively impersonal, one-way form of influence over an extended period of time. The NDEA group, on the other hand, was exposed to a much more personal, two-way form of influence over a concentrated period of time.

The opportunities for interpersonal (and inter-racial) contact, face-to-face communication with other participants, the opportunity to challenge authority figures (high status lecturers) directly, and a host of other factors were operating within the NDEA group but were essentially absent from the WGBH group. These factors could reasonably be expected to have an effect upon an individual's acceptance of other people which is what the human-heartedness scale was designed to measure. It is, however, impossible to say which specific aspect or aspects of the NDEA program caused the observed difference.

---

[1] It is important to re-emphasize that the absence of a "zero treatment" control group makes it impossible to interpret the significance of the within group changes.

Conclusions and Recommendations

On the basis of the before-after data gathered from the participants of the 1965 NDEA Summer Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Youth and a sample of viewers of WGBH's television series entitled "Education and Race Relations", it was concluded that:

(a) with respect to the level of rationality an individual exhibits in his thinking toward minority groups, no differential effects were observed when the results of the two programs were compared;

(b) with respect to an individual's level of human-heartedness (acceptance of minority groups), it was found that the NDEA program was significantly more effective than the WGBH program in producing positive changes;

(c) and although it could not be demonstrated conclusively, it was suggested that the differential results might be attributable to differences in program format in terms of the opportunities afforded for interpersonal contact and face-to-face communication.

As with any research of this kind, the results often generate more questions than answers. The data suggest many fruitful areas for further research. Certain people, for example, more than others, may be susceptible to television as a medium of influence. Perhaps the number of programs viewed by an individual might affect the amount of change observed. Many such variables were uncontrolled in the present study.

It would also be valuable if experiments could be conducted to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of a variety of different types of television programs. For example, how effective would it be if, instead of a high status lecturer presenting some material, a group of peers (e.g. fellow school teachers) were to debate a series of central issues in the area of education and race relations?

Many such questions can be asked and the answers could be extremely important when one considers that 98.8% of all American families own at least one television set. As a medium of potential influence, television is too important to overlook.

Report on Dissemination Efforts Relating to

"Education and Race Relations" Course

I. Full sets of the 16 mm. films based on the 28 television series have been supplied to the U. S. Office of Education and the following State Departments of Education, and, in turn, to several colleges, school systems, and organizations:

A. New York State Department of Education

B. Connecticut State Department of Education

C. Rhode Island State Department of Education

D. Pennsylvania State Department of Education

E. Maine State Department of Education

F. New Hampshire State Department of Education

G. Rhode Island State Department of Education

H. New Jersey State Department of Education

II. The 16 mm. film series on "Education and Race Relations" was an essential substantive component of the N.D.E.A. Institute for Advanced Study held for teachers of Disadvantaged Youth at Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, July 11 - July 22, 1966, and part-time, 15 Saturdays, September 24, 1966, to January 14, 1967.

N.B. Total teachers affected -- 327

III. A book geared to college graduate level study purposes, entitled POVERTY, EDUCATION AND RACE RELATIONS: STUDIES AND PROPOSALS, was prepared for publication by Allyn and Bacon Company of Boston essentially from the manuscripts of the lectures presented in this "Education and Race Relations" course.

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS SPONSORING "EDUCATION AND RACE RELATIONS" IN-SERVICE TRAINING COURSE

School System	Faculty Coordinator	Number of Students
1. Boston	Grace Whitaker	70
2. Cambridge	William Conley	45
3. Lexington	Paul F. Poehler, Jr.	9
4. Medford	George Sullivan	93
5. Newton	William Hollman	26
6. Somerville	Daniel Macera	53
		296

c/o 713 cat. NCRIPPO

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF THE
COLLEGE COORDINATOR FOR THE
TELEVISION COURSE
EDUCATION AND RACE RELATIONS

Work with the participants in the Education and Race Relations television course began during July, 1965, when I spent three full weeks between the period of July 10 and August 20 in the assembly and production of the syllabus for the course, and updating of the bibliography, with the assistance of the principal speakers and moderators of the program who appeared in the television teaching lessons.

The study guide and discussion outline was distributed widely to the participating colleges in time for students to receive the material prior to the original broadcast date in October, 1965. The names of the universities and colleges, together with the coordinators within the individual colleges are listed on the attached sheet. For those colleges within the broadcast signal range of Boston's educational station WGBH-TV, which are Boston, Framingham, Fitchburg, Salem, Bridgewater, and Lowell, the pupil participants had the opportunity to listen to the broadcasts beginning at 4:15 p.m. on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons.

The series of 28 broadcasts were divided as follows: the initial 45-minute program contained the substantive presentation by an expert in his field, and the second program broadcast two days later was a discussion by qualified teachers and experts of the substantive presentation given earlier.

It should be noted that both the substantive program and the discussion of it were broadcast on Sunday afternoons over Channel 2 in a repeat broadcast which

many of the student participants viewed as either review or as a make-up viewing because they had been unable to watch the earlier television lessons that were broadcast in the middle of the week.

The only exception to the method of presentation were programs 4A and B and 5A, which consisted of the substantive presentation by Professor C. Eric Lincoln on The Negro in American History. Program 5B was a discussion of Dr. Lincoln's presentation.

Working with the coordinators at the individual colleges by mail, telephone, and in person, I found that the pattern in each of the colleges giving course credit was as follows:

Where the programs were received on live television, the time of the course was immediately following a Thursday afternoon broadcast, and discussion of the program and its content ran for two hours. Typical of the classrooms observed were those at Northeastern, Boston, and North Adams. At Northeastern, where the course was conducted by Mr. Noel Day, who at that time was Lecturer in Sociology at Northeastern's University College, headed his own consulting firm in social planning, and also served as Executive Director of the St. Mark Social Center in Roxbury, Massachusetts, I spent the day on December 2, 1965. Mr. Noel Day was absent on that occasion, but I was given the full cooperation of Dr. Donald Lovejoy of Northeastern, and participated with the graduate and undergraduate students who were taking the Education and Race Relations course. A television set was wheeled into the class and the audio portion of the course was recorded at the time of the broadcast for future reference.

Following the broadcast Dr. Lovejoy introduced me to the class, with whom I spent the next hour and a half in discussion of the course sessions and critiques of the individual course offerings via television. The discussion was lively, with four of the twelve participants being more articulate than the others.

The overall impression was that had the discussion programs followed immediately on the end of the lecture portion of the programs, as they had on Sunday afternoons, the course offering would have been improved. The implication was that the time lag of two days made the discussion section of the program too much of an entity in itself and less of a springboard from which the classroom participants could begin their own discussions.

The assignment was given to the group to write critical reactions to (a) the television presentations, with particular attention to an individual program, and (b) reports on one of the items read in the course. I also appealed to the group for samples of any materials which they may have developed for teaching secondary students about race relations.

At Boston it was interesting to note that a full and free discussion on the role of the Federal government in education followed the presentation by Dr. Jean Grambs on "Teaching Techniques and Materials." There was considerable interest in Dr. Grambs' presentation of role playing situations and the use of role playing as a case study method for the better understanding of human relations. One of the students in the class, however, raised the point that since the television programs were heavily funded, was the Federal government, therefore, trying to

direct teaching methods from Washington. The discussion concerning this issue was lively, and is an example of some of the unexpected outcomes from the television broadcasts. It can be said in conclusion that the question of "Federal intervention in local school situations" was resolved in favor of the advantages of using Federal money to improve education in general.

Where the broadcasts could not be received, kinescopes made from the television tapes were made available, so that the students could watch a film showing of both the substantive presentation and the subsequent discussion. In discussing the reactions of the pupils to both the on-the-air program and the film presentations, I found the feeling to be split approximately fifty-fifty between two points of view. One group felt that the two-day time lapse between the substantive presentation and the discussion of that presentation was valuable, because some of the subtler points raised by the substantive presentation could be better digested before the discussion sessions were broadcast, and this enabled the class to be better prepared for the discussion of the pros and cons of the subject matter under consideration.

The other point of view was that viewing a full hour and a half of presentation and discussion, as was the case in most places where the Education and Race Relations was viewed by film, the full 90 minutes of concentration made for a better understanding of the subject matter.

My own judgment and my experience with working with the coordinators all during the fall, winter, and spring of 1965-66, was that the classroom atmosphere

depended, as it usually does to a large extent, on the leadership being given by the instructor in charge.

In summary I have found that the reaction of participants and instructors who took the Education and Race Relations course, either by film or television, was that the course did give valuable information, but that above this the principal value of the course was in its presentation of new materials which gave new light on the relationship between Negroes and whites, and the role of education as an agent of change in bettering those relations.

COLLEGES GIVING
COURSE CREDITS IN
EDUCATION AND RACE RELATIONS

State Colleges

College	Coordinator	Number of Students Participating
Boston	Dr. George Aherne	35
Bridgewater	Dr. Shirley Kolack	13
Fitchburg	Dr. Harry Crowley	24
Framingham	Professor Miriam Riley	18
Lowell	Dr. Patricia Goler	17
Salem	Dr. Vincent Hawes	8
Worcester	Professor Vera Dowden	17
North Adams	Professor John M. McNulty	43

Private Colleges

Boston College	Dr. Mary Griffin	10
Boston University	Dr. Calvin Deam	5
Emmanuel	Miss Claire Larracey	10
Northeastern Univ.	Mr. Donald Lovejoy	10
Northeastern Adult Education	Mr. Ray C. Dethy	30